

Claims 1 – 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102B is being anticipated by Adair et al (U.S. Patent No. 504,877; “Adair”).

Independent Claim 1, as examined, provides a method for producing a polymer particle composite. The method comprises:

A step of forming a polymer-containing layer mainly forming of a polymeric material and a step of bringing a particle suspension containing the particle dispersed in the solvent capable of swelling the polymeric material into contact with the polymer-containing layer.

To establish anticipation of claim 1, the Office Action must prove that Adair discloses all of the elements of Claim 1 as set forth therein. The applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action fails to meet this burden.

Adair discloses the utilization of standard photolithography to create a pattern on the substrate of a silicon wafer (column 3, lines 49-50). The process imparts a positive surface charge to the silicon wafer by treating the substrate with polymers (column 3, lines 60-63). The treated substrate is then immersed in an aqueous suspension of diamond particles (column 4, lines 29-31). The diamond particles are negatively charged. Accordingly, they adhere to the positively charged silicon substrate (column 4, lines 32-36).

The Office Action equates the application of the negatively charged polymer of Adair to the step of “forming a polymer-containing layer...” of claim 1. The Office Action equates the immersion of the substrate into the solution of diamond particles to the step of “bringing a particle suspension containing the particle dispersed in a solvent capable of swelling the polymeric material into contact with the polymer-containing layer”. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Nowhere in Adair is it indicated that the solution of diamond particles is capable of swelling the polymer coating. The invention of Adair requires a removable mask made from photo resist to achieve a patterned deposition (column 2, lines 11-16). There is no description in Adair indicating that a pattern deposition can be achieved without a removable mask nor is there any description suggesting a polymer absorption layer formed in a pattern.

In contrast, the subject matter of the present application provides a patterned deposition layer by forming polymer-containing layers with a swelling function in the pattern. Accordingly, no removable mask is necessary. Therefore, the applicant respectfully submit that Adair does not disclose all the elements of Claim 1 as set forth therein.

Claims 1-2, 4, 10, 12 - 13 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102B as being anticipated by Gould, U.S. Patent No. 4061827.

The applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action fails to establish that Gould discloses all the elements of Independent Claim 1 as set forth therein. Gould does not disclose a solvent capable of swelling a polymer material. Rather Gould discloses a method of merely passing a fabric through a slurry of electrically conductive carbon particles and absorbing the particles on the surface of the fabric. Gould does not disclose the provisions of a composite film with multilayer particles formed by swelling. Therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action has failed to establish the anticipation of independent claim 2 with respect to Gould.

The applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that Claim 22 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. In view of the aforesaid, however, the applicant respectfully submits that all claims provided herein are allowable. Favorable reconsideration is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas S. Rupert  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 44,434

Dated: 12/30, 2002

WILDMAN, HARROLD, ALLEN & DIXON  
225 West Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1229  
Telephone: (312) 201-2000  
Facsimile: (312) 201-2555